



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 16

Application Number: 09/213,907
Filing Date: December 17, 1998
Appellant(s): HOOPER ET AL.

Joseph R. Burwell
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

MAILED

JAN 08 2004

Technology Center 2100

Art Unit: 2142

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 6/23/03.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) *Issues*

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) *Grouping of Claims*

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims

Group A: Claims 1,4-6,9,10,13,14,16,19-21 and 23

Group B: Claims 17 and 22

Group C: Claims 7,8 and 15

Art Unit: 2142

do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR

1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

5,261,080	Khoyi et al	11-1993
6,233,623 B1	Jeffords et al	5-2001
5,754,763	Bereiter	5-1998

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

1. Claims 1,10,17,22,23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Khoyi et al [Khoyi 5,261,080] in view of Jeffords et al [6,233,623 B1]

As per claim 1, Khoyi discloses a method of managing a set of clients in a distributed network having management server (i.e.: manager object) [an object based data processing system having a set of workstations 178 and host 170, Khoyi, Fig 1A];

associating a manager object to each application type (i.e.: object type) on a given client [object manager managing object type and its instances, Khoyi col 36 lines 5-36],

However Khoyi does not explicitly discloses the manager object including a registry for register objects.

Art Unit: 2142

A skilled artisan would have motivation to improve the manager object on Khoyi's apparatus and found Jeffords teaching. Jeffords discloses a manager object including a registry having a set of one or more elements such as manger object having an associated set of memory pools and a registry of the network unique identifiers for the resource objects in the associated set of memory pools where each pool representing an RRM process which is equivalent to the element includes information representing a context of an application instance [Jeffords, col 3 lines 53-67, Fig 1]. Jeffords discloses the Resource manager provides a registry of resource objects and a mechanism fro communicating with other Resource Managers [Jeffords, col 16 lines 22-29, col 19 lines 10-13]. Jeffords also taught redirecting the modified query to the client machine [network manager resides in a host received and interpret resources, Jeffords col 15 lines 47-67].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the registry with a set of memory pools as taught by Jeffords into the Khoyi's apparatus in order to improve the manager object. Doing so would provide a simple, dynamic and efficient process to the manager object of the distributed computing system.

2. Claims 10,17,22,23 contain the similar limitations set forth of method claim 1.

Therefore, claims 10,17,22,23 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 1.

Art Unit: 2142

3. As per claims 4,19 Khoyi-Jeffords disclose the element includes information identifying a client node such as user logon ID [Khoyi col 28 lines 50-60].
4. As per claims 5, 20 Khoyi-Jeffords disclose the element includes information identifying a directory where the application instance is installed [Jeffords col 14 lines 60-65].
5. As per claims 6,21 Khoyi-Jeffords disclose the element includes information identifying a name of a resource where the application instance such as object name [Khoyi col 26 lines 44-50][Jeffords col 12 lines 51-58].
6. As per claim 7, Khoyi-Jeffords disclose the application type is discovered by the manager object [Jeffords col 5 lines 20-30].
7. As per claims 8,15 Khoyi-Jeffords disclose including the step of discovering the application type prior to associating the manager object as inherent feature of a resource manager which manages the objects [Jeffords col 5 lines 20-30].
8. As per claims 9,16 Khoyi-Jeffords disclose the manager object is managed by the management server [Jeffords col 7 lines 38-45].

Art Unit: 2142

9. Claims 2-3,11-12,18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Khoyi et al [Khoyi 6,101,527] in view of Jeffords et al [6,233,623 B1] and further in view of Bereiter [5,754,763]

10. As per claims 2,11 Khoyi-Jeffords is silent on the given client supports a dataless management framework. A skilled artisan would have looked to the distributed computer art to improve the Khoyi-Jeffords's system and found the Bereiter's teaching. Bereiter discloses a distributed computer enterprise environment using management server with one or more gateway machines and plurality of endpoint machines wherein the client component is preferably dataless [Bereiter col 4 lines 36-54]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the technique using distributed computer system with dataless client as taught by Bereiter into the Khoyi-Jeffords's system in order to provide the stability and extensibility to the large enterprise network.

11. As per claims 3,12,18 Khoyi-Bereiter disclose the dataless management framework includes a local agent that is controlled by the manager object to manage the application instance as inherent feature of dataless management framework [Bereiter col 4 lines 36-54].

Thus, as explained above, the system and method of claims 1-23 is obvious in view of the prior art.

Art Unit: 2142

(11) Response to Argument

Argument 8.A:

A. As per claim 1, applicant argues the prior art does not disclose a method of managing a set of clients in a distributed network having management server;

A. Examiner notes the prior art taught a method of managing a set of clients in a distributed network having management server [an object based data processing system having a set of workstations 178 and host 170, Khoyi Fig 1A]. It is obvious a management server which contained a object or program, software distributed data to a set of client nodes or terminal

B. As per claim 1, applicant argues the prior art does not disclose associating a manager object to each application type on a given client (i.e.: a manager object is associated with a given application type for the purpose of managing that application and its instances directly, specification page 14, lines 12-14; as an application is started, a corresponding manager object is associated therewith. The manager object is then used to manage the application and its instances directly. The set of manager objects associated with a given client application type may be supported anywhere in the network, specification, page15 lines 6-13; page 17 lines 4-7; use of to manage a given application type and/or application instance enables finer granularity of access control, page 18 lines 18-20; a discovery routine identified application type, page16, lines 14-18),

Art Unit: 2142

B. Examiner notes the prior art taught associating a manager object to each application type on a given client [object manager managing object type and its instances, Khoyi col 36 lines 5-36], the manager object including a registry having a set of one or more elements, wherein each element includes information representing a context of an application instance [a registry of resource objects, Jeffords, col 3 lines 53-67, col 16 lines 22-24]. It is obvious that the server contained software and data type which distributed to a set of client nodes as requested. In order to get the permission to access to server, the client nodes have to registered to resource object or program/software on server such as network operation using object manager taught by Khoyi.

C. As per claim 1, applicant argues the prior art does not disclose the manager object including a registry having a set of one or more elements, wherein each element includes information representing a context of an application instance; managing all instances of the application through the manager object.

C. Examiner notes the prior art taught managing all instances of the application through the manager object [resource manager 10-14 having an associated set of resources pools 16,17,18 which contain a plurality of resource objects 20, Jeffords Fig 1; the parameter list , Khoyi, col 76 lines 15-33] wherein each resource manager includes a central registry of resources in its associated pool and contains mechanism (i.e.: one or more elements) for communicating with other resource managers, Jeffords col 3 lines 53-67]

Art Unit: 2142

Argument 8.B:

(A) As per claim 22, applicant argues the prior art does not teach intercepting a query directed to the client machine for managing the application type;

(A) Examiner notes the prior art taught intercepting (i.e.: identify) a query (i.e.: request) directed to the client machine for managing the application type (i.e.: object type) [system database with object manager table including object type and request , Khoyi Fig 3; identifying each type of object, Khoyi col 25 lines 6-20; handle all of requests for a particular object type, Khoyi col 26 lines 29-33, col 34 lines 37-44; a set of operation performed on all types of object, Khoyi col 32 lines 54-65; identify the object type on the object manager table entries Khoyi col 35 lines 33-col 36 line 62];

(B) As per claim 22, applicant argues the prior art does not teach modifying the query with information representing a context of a given application instance identified in the query;

(B) Examiner notes the prior art taught modifying (i.e.: edit, customize) the query with information representing a context of a given application instance identified in the query [customize the request, Khoyi col 33 lines 45-55; customize the profile of object, Khoyi col 36 lines 40-62; object is modified, col 42 lines 29-39; editable by object manager, col 43 lines 33-55; edit application, col 60 lines 1-9; edit resource, col 84 lines 29-34];

Art Unit: 2142

(C) As per claim 22, applicant argues the prior art does not teach redirecting the modified query to the client machine to target management of the given application instance directly.

(C) Examiner notes the prior art taught redirecting (i.e.: conversion) the modified query to the client machine to target management of the given application instance (i.e.: object instance) directly interchange type wherein the child's data is converted in passing to parent object, Khoyi col 32 lines 10-12; col 40 lines 24-38; database format used in converting and communicating certain document types and spreadsheet objects, col 53 lines 14-22].

Argument 8.C:

As per claim 7, applicant argues the prior art does not teach the application is discovered by the manager object.

Examiner notes the prior art taught the application (i.e.: object) is discovered (i.e.: identified) by the manager object [system database with object manager table including object type and request, Khoyi Fig 3; identifying each type of object, Khoyi col 25 lines 6-20; handle all of requests for a particular object type, Khoyi col 26 lines 29-33, col 34 lines 37-44; a set of operation performed on all types of object, Khoyi col 32 lines 54-65; identify the object type on the object manager table entries Khoyi col 35 lines 33-col 36 line 62];

Thus, the invention claims are clearly defined by the prior art and the rejection is sustained.

Art Unit: 2142

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.


Respectfully submitted,

Thong Vu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142

December 16, 2003



Conferees



BUNJOB JAROENCHANWANIT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

MARC D. THOMPSON
MDT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

LAW OFFICE OF JOSEPH R. BURWELL
P.O. BOX 28022
AUSTIN, TX 78755-8022